

Issued Date: December 11, 2025

From: Director Bonnie Glenn
Office of Police Accountability



Case Number: 2025OPA-0261

Allegations of Misconduct & Director's Findings

Named Employee #1

- 1. Allegation #1: 4.010 – Employee Time Off 4.010-POL 2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor**

Finding: Sustained

- 2. Allegation #2: 5.090 – Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters I. Duty Hours C. Responsibilities 3. Officers will report for duty, fully equipped and prepared, at the start of their watch.**

Finding: Sustained

- **Imposed Discipline: Resigned Prior to Discipline Proposal**
-

This Closed Case Summary (CCS) represents the opinion of the OPA Director regarding the misconduct alleged and therefore sections may be written in the first person.

Executive Summary:

The Complainant alleged Named Employee #1 (NE#1), a former police officer, was absent without leave during his scheduled shift on June 20, 2025.

Administrative Note:

On October 7, 2025, OIG certified OPA's investigation as thorough, timely, and objective.

No contractual 180-day timeline applies to this case as NE#1 separated from SPD while the investigation was still pending.

Summary of the Investigation:

OPA investigated the complaint by reviewing the complaint documentation, conducting a search of computer-aided dispatch information, reviewing the applicable staffing calendar, proximity card records, phone records, text message records, and email records. OPA also reviewed a “meeting summary” concerning a prior instance of NE#1 being absent without leave, and NE#1’s resignation packet. OPA interviewed NE#1’s immediate supervisor, Witness Employee #1 (WE#1). OPA attempted to interview NE#1. NE#1 agreed to be interviewed voluntarily over Microsoft Teams but then did not appear at the scheduled date and time.

OPA finds that, more likely than not, the following occurred. On June 20, 2025, NE#1 was scheduled to work a second watch shift. Prior to that date and time, he did not request time off or receive permission to be late. Immediately prior to the shift, NE#1 texted WE#1 that he would be late. After several hours, NE#1 was still absent. WE#1 reached out to NE#1 by phone. Over a phone call, NE#1 told WE#1 he would arrive in an hour. NE#1 never arrived for work on June 20, 2025.

OPA found evidence that NE#1 was previously counseled regarding absenteeism, resulting in his completing a memorandum on the importance of adhering to policy regarding scheduling time off. WE#1 also reported NE#1 had other issues with absenteeism, including a time he was absent due to his dog passing away. OPA also found evidence that NE#1 reported having an illness to WE#1 in August 2025 and cited “health reasons” when resigning from SPD in September 2025. There was inconclusive evidence to determine whether NE#1’s reason for being absent on June 20, 2025, was connected to his later disclosed health issues and resignation.

Analysis and Conclusions:

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #1

1. 4.010 – Employee Time Off 4.010-POL 2. Employees Schedule Time Off With Their Sergeant/Supervisor

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was absent without leave on June 20, 2025.

SPD Policy 4.010-POL-2 requires SPD employees to schedule time off with their supervisors. The policy states that: “Employees will contact their sergeant/supervisor before their scheduled work shift to request an unscheduled absence from duty.” SPD Policy 4.010-POL-2.

OPA finds that, more likely than not, NE#1 was aware he would regularly be late for second watch on Fridays, but did not request to be late on June 20, 2025, until about 10:33 AM. At that time, NE#1 requested to be about half an hour late. Even if WE#1 had approved the request to be

late—which he did not—NE#1 did not show up that day at all. Around 4:44 PM, when NE#1 had still not reported, WE#1 reached out again by phone. At that time, NE#1 stated he would arrive in about an hour. This also did not occur. Thereafter, NE#1 did not offer WE#1 any other explanation for why he did not report to work on June 20, 2025.

OPA recognizes and is sympathetic to the fact that NE#1 may be experiencing a challenging health situation. But OPA found no evidence to suggest NE#1 was unable to follow policy in June 2025 due to a health situation he appears to have first reported around August 2025. Moreover, OPA also observed significant evidence that NE#1 struggled with more than routine absenteeism without making appropriate notifications or requests during his short time at SPD. Relatedly, NE#1 agreed to a voluntary interview with OPA online but then did not show up at the scheduled time. Accordingly, NE#1 did not provide any explanation or elaboration to OPA, despite being afforded the opportunity to do so.

Accordingly, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**

Named Employee #1 – Allegation #2

1. 5.090 – Operations Bureau General Personnel Matters I. Duty Hours C. Responsibilities 3. Officers will report for duty, fully equipped and prepared, at the start of their watch.

The Complainant alleged that NE#1 was absent without leave on June 20, 2025.

SPD Policy requires patrol officers to report for duty, fully equipped and prepared, at the start of their watch. SPD Policy 5.090(I)(C)(3).

For the same reasons articulated above at Allegation #1, OPA recommends this allegation be Sustained.

Recommended Finding: **Sustained**